



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TWO DEFINITIONS OF AN ABELIAN GROUP BY SETS OF INDEPENDENT POSTULATES*

BY

EDWARD V. HUNTINGTON

The following definitions of an Abelian (commutative) group are suggested immediately by the writer's definitions of a general group published in the *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, ser. 2, vol. 8 (1901-1902), pp. 296-300, 388-391.†

§ 1. FIRST DEFINITION: BY THREE POSTULATES.

A set of elements in which a rule of combination \circ is so defined as to satisfy the following three postulates shall be called an Abelian group with respect to \circ :

- 1) $a \circ b = b \circ a$, whenever a, b and $b \circ a$ belong to the set.
- 2) $(a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c)$, whenever $a, b, c, a \circ b, b \circ c$ and $a \circ (b \circ c)$ belong to the set.
- 3) For every two elements a and b ($a = b$ or $a \neq b$) there is an element x in the set such that $a \circ x = b$.

If we wish to distinguish between finite and infinite groups we may add a fourth postulate, either

- a) The set contains n elements; or
- b) The set is infinite.

Familiar examples of a finite and an infinite Abelian group are the following:

A) The system of the first n positive integers, with the rule of combination defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{lll} a \circ b = a + b & \text{when} & a + b \leq n, \\ = a + b - n & \text{when} & a + b > n. \end{array}$$

B) The system of all integers, positive, negative and zero, with $a \circ b = a + b$; or the system of all positive rational numbers, with $a \circ b = a \times b$.

* Presented to the Society October 25, 1902. Received for publication October 4, 1902.

† Cf. E. H. MOORE, *Transactions*, vol. 3 (1902), pp. 485-492. Professor MOORE's criticism of "multiple statements" suggested the present form of postulates 1 and 2.

The following theorems, deduced from postulates 1, 2, 3, show that the present definition is equivalent to the definitions usually given.*

THEOREM I. *The element x in 3 is uniquely determined by a and b .*

Proof. Suppose $a \circ x = b$ and also $a \circ x' = b$; and by 3 take ξ so that $x \circ \xi = x'$. Then by hypothesis $a \circ (x \circ \xi) = b$; or, by 2, $(a \circ x) \circ \xi = b$; or, $b \circ \xi = b$. Now by 3 and 1 take η so that $\eta \circ b = x$. Then $\eta \circ (b \circ \xi) = x$; or, by 2, $(\eta \circ b) \circ \xi = x$; or, $x \circ \xi = x$. Therefore $x = x'$.

COROLLARY. If $a \circ b = a \circ b'$ then $b = b'$.

THEOREM II. *There is a peculiar element e in the set, such that $b \circ e = b$ for every element b .*

Proof. Take any element a and by 3 take e so that $a \circ e = a$; the element e thus determined (Theorem I) is the peculiar element required. For, let b be any other element than a , and by 3 and 1 take x so that $x \circ a = b$. Then $x \circ (a \circ e) = b$; or, by 2, $(x \circ a) \circ e = b$; or $b \circ e = b$.

THEOREM III. *Whenever a and b belong to the set, $a \circ b$ also belongs to the set.*

Proof. By 3 and 1 there is an element b' such that $b' \circ b = e$ and also an element c such that $c \circ b' = a$. Then $c = a \circ b$. For, by 3 take β so that $a \circ \beta = c$ and β' so that $\beta \circ \beta' = e$. Then

$$c \circ b' = a = a \circ (\beta \circ \beta') = (a \circ \beta) \circ \beta' = c \circ \beta'$$

by 2; hence $b' = \beta'$. Then $b' \circ \beta = \beta' \circ \beta = e = b' \circ b$ by 1; hence $\beta = b$. Therefore $a \circ b = c$.

Independence of postulates 1, 2, 3 and a), when $n > 2$.

The mutual independence of postulates 1, 2, 3 and a), when $n > 2$,† is shown by the following systems, each of which satisfies all the other postulates but not the one for which it is numbered.

(1) The system of the first n positive integers, with $a \circ b = b$.

(2) The system of the first n positive integers, with the rule of combination defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a \circ b &= a + b & \text{when} & \quad a + b \leq n, \\ &= a + b - n & \text{when} & \quad a + b > n; \end{aligned}$$

except that $a \circ b = 2$ when $a + b = n + 1$,

and $a \circ b = 1$ when $a + b = 2$ or $n + 2$.

(3) The system of the first n positive integers, with $a \circ b = 1$.

(a) Any infinite Abelian group, such as B) above.

*The proofs of these theorems become, of course, much simpler if we confine ourselves to finite groups.

† When $n = 1$, postulate 3 is sufficient. When $n = 2$, postulates 1 and 3 are sufficient and independent.

Independence of postulates 1, 2, 3 and b).

Similarly, the independence of postulates 1, 2, 3 and b) is shown by the following systems:

- [1] The system of all positive integers, with $a \circ b = b$.
- [2] The system of all rational numbers, with $a \circ b = (a + b)/2$.
- [3] The system of all positive integers, with $a \circ b = 1$.
- [b] Any finite Abelian group, such as A) above.

§2. SECOND DEFINITION: BY FOUR POSTULATES.

An Abelian group may be defined also by the following four postulates:

- 1') $a \circ b = b \circ a$, whenever $a, b, a \circ b$ and $b \circ a$ all belong to the set.
- 2') $(a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c)$, whenever $a, b, c, a \circ b, b \circ c, (a \circ b) \circ c$ and $a \circ (b \circ c)$ all belong to the set.
- 3') For every two elements a and b ($a = b$ or $a \neq b$) there is an element x' in the set such that $(a \circ x') \circ b = b$.
- 4') If a and b belong to the set, then $a \circ b$ also belongs to the set.

To show that this second definition agrees with the first, we have only to notice that the truth of 3 follows at once from 2', 3', 4'. ($x = x' \circ b$.)

Independence of postulates 1', 2', 3', 4' and a), when $n > 2$.

The independence of these postulates for finite groups, when $n > 2$,* is established by the use of the following systems:

- (1'), (2'), (3'), (a). Same as the systems (1), (2), (3), (a) above.
- (4') The system of the first n positive integers, with the rule of combination defined as follows: $a \circ a = 1$; $1 \circ b = b$; otherwise $a \circ b = z$, an object not belonging to the set.

Independence of postulates 1', 2', 3', 4' and b).

Similarly, the independence of these postulates for infinite groups is shown by the following systems:

- [1'], [2'], [3'], [b]. Same as the systems [1], [2], [3], [b] above.
- [4'] The system of all integers except ± 1 , with $a \circ b = a + b$.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

August, 1902.

* When $n = 1$, postulate 4' is sufficient. When $n = 2$, postulates 1', 3', 4' are sufficient and independent.

POSTSCRIPT.*

In the course of an article entitled *A Definition of Abstract Groups*,† which appeared while the present paper was going through the press, Professor E. H. MOORE takes up my first (three-postulate) definition of a group,

$$(H_1) : (2', 9', 10'),$$

and after pointing out that the postulate $2'$ can be broken up into two component statements $2'_1$ and $2'_2$, raises the question as to the independence of the four postulates

$$(H'_1) : (2'_1, 2'_2, 9', 10').$$

As an answer to this question the following result may be not without interest: I find that either of the postulates $2'_1$ and $2'_2$ can be deduced as a theorem from the remaining three. That is, my first definition (H_1) may be replaced by a new three-postulate definition, say

$$(H''_1) : (2'_2, 9', 10'),$$

in which the postulate $2'_2$ is "milder" than the postulate $2'$. (The old proofs of independence hold for (H''_1) , for both finite and infinite groups.)

The actual deduction of $2'_1$ from $9'$, $10'$ and $2'_2$ proceeds as follows:‡ We have

9') For every two elements a, b there is an element x such that $a \circ x = b$.

10') For every two elements a, b there is an element y such that $y \circ a = b$.

2'_2) If a, b, c are three elements such that the products $a \circ b$, $b \circ c$ and $a \circ (b \circ c)$ belong to the set, then $(a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c)$.

LEMMA. If $a \circ b = a \circ b'$ (both products belonging to the set), then $b = b'$.

Proof. Let $c = a \circ b = a \circ b'$, and by 9' take x so that $b \circ x = b'$. Then, by hypothesis, $a \circ (b \circ x) = c$; or, by 2'_2, $(a \circ b) \circ x = c$; or, $c \circ x = c$. Now by 10' take y so that $y \circ c = b$. Then $y \circ (c \circ x) = b$; or, by 2'_2, $(y \circ c) \circ x = b$; or, $b \circ x = b$. Hence $b = b'$.

THEOREM 2'_1. If a, b, c are three elements such that the products $a \circ b$, $b \circ c$ and $(a \circ b) \circ c$ belong to the set, then $(a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c)$.

Proof. By 9' take x so that $a \circ x = (a \circ b) \circ c$ and also z so that $b \circ z = x$. Then $a \circ (b \circ z) = (a \circ b) \circ c$. But by 2'_2, $a \circ (b \circ z) = (a \circ b) \circ z$. Therefore $c = z$, by the Lemma. Hence $b \circ c = x$; or, $a \circ (b \circ c) = (a \circ b) \circ c$.

In like manner we might have deduced $2'_2$ from $9'$, $10'$ and $2'_1$.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,

October 31, 1902.

* Received for publication November 26, 1902.

† Transactions, vol. 3 (October, 1902), pp. 485-492.

‡ In the case of Abelian groups this deduction is not necessary.